

the point that I think there is a point here. And, Mr. President, the point is that for three years, since I've been here, the motion was made, if failed to receive 40 votes it was then read again. I withdraw my motion.

SPEAKER LUEDTKE: All right. Thank you, Senator Mills. Now Senator DeCamp, would you close on your motion.

SENATOR DeCAMP: This is one of those rare cases where every single person is right on this issue. It is true that in the past we had followed a different procedure. That happens to have been a violation of the statutes. The other day, when we did this matter, Jerry Whelan, astute lawyer, researcher, whatever that he is, found this Section of the statutes. Therefore, he made us follow the new procedure, or the procedure that has actually existed in the law for some time that we had not been following. As a consequence Jack Mills, who would have been successful in at least getting his issue on the November ballot, was thwarted through a fluke of fate or whatever. My intent here today is merely to give him the opportunity to have the vote under the conditions that he should have gotten in the first place. But there is another lesson for all of us to learn here. I would like to urge you to pay particularly close attention to another bill where you're putting a legislative rule procedure into the statutes rather than into the rule book. It will haunt you some day. It is Senator Bereuter's proposal. The proposal to have business, economic impact. Think about that one. You start putting things like that in the statutes and it will tie up the Legislature. You can't suspend it. You can't solve the problem that way. You can't address the problem because you are tied into a statute. So I suggest that we correct this one by putting this matter in the rules. Remember I asked your permission to suspend the rules the other day and introduce a special bill to correct the very problem that occurred. That bill is now introduced. I will bring it to the floor as soon as we can. We can correct this situation so it doesn't occur in the future, so we can handle it in an orderly manner. But at this time there is a shortage of people here. Jack has enough votes, if everybody is here, or almost everybody, to get this reconsidered. So I guess what I'm suggesting to you is that a few of you, that might even vote against it, might even vote against it on its final passage, at least give him the benefit of the doubt here and let the reconsideration motion pass. Once the reconsideration motion passes we can sit on it until such time as can be moved to Final or whatever. All we're doing now is giving life to this particular idea. One other thing. Senator Nichol raised a point. He said we've got to be careful about giving exemptions and on, and on, and on, and people buying faulty or hustle type solar equipment. Wait a minute. You're not doing that with this thing if you pass it. You're not doing that at all. All you're doing is putting on the ballot the question of whether the people should give the Legislature authority to make laws in this area. You're not giving exemptions necessarily. It's still back in your hands. You make the decisions in the future. That is all you're doing. So it isn't as if you're giving away the farm or anything. You're putting it on the ballot, first of all, to determine where the people want you to decide in this area, and second, if they do, you still have all of the decision-making authority here. So I think you ought to give Jack a vote to at least have the reconsideration. We can debate the merits another day.